From:	Alex Safian
To:	Carlone, Dennis
Subject:	Thanks and further to our discussion
Date:	Wednesday, April 18, 2018 7:53:16 PM

Dear Councillor Carlone:

Thanks again for meeting with me today at City Hall -- I greatly appreciate the time you gave me on what was obviously a very busy day for you. Sorry for monopolizing the conversation; if at some point in the future you'd like to continue the conversation I'd be happy to listen more and say less. It's just that under the circumstances today there was much that I wanted to convey.

While you said at the start of the meeting that neither of us was likely to convince the other, you did open my eyes to the fact that you come at this problem with a great deal of good will, deep moral convictions, and a genuine desire to make things better and come up with solutions. And obviously you're very well read on the subject.

But I do fear that if efforts such as the one in Cambridge succeed, this will make peace less likely, not more likely. This is because it will convince Israelis that no matter what they do they can't get a fair shake, and it will convince Palestinians that there is no need for them to make painful concessions for peace too. A yes vote will tell Palestinians all they have to do is wait and Israel will be forced to give in to all their demands. And that is just a recipe for further conflict and suffering on both sides. Which clearly is the last thing that you would want.

For your convenience below is a summary of where I think the AFSC fact sheet actually argues against their position -- these correspond to the marked sections on the document I left with you. After the summary are some points related to the Israeli/Palestinian issue.

A. Issues relating to HP and Israel

The American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) is one of the major backers of the effort to boycott HP for various reasons, including HP's involvement in Israel, and they and their allies have filed multiple FOIA requests under Israel's Freedom of Information Act. What they found unintentionally does great damage to their argument for boycotting HP or HPE.

The document outlining their findings is here, and commentary followed by key excerpts is below:

1. AFSC acknowledges the split in HP, and the further spin-offs from HPE into independent companies, including DXC. They further acknowledge that DXC now handles most of the business with Israel that supposedly violates human rights and justifies a boycott. So why aren't they instead calling for the boycott of DXC? Probably because DXC doesn't make consumer products and so few have even heard of them:

> Hewlett-Packard Company, the original company that is now defunct, has worked closely with the Israeli military and several Israeli authorities on a wide range of occupation-related projects at least since the 1990s. Many of these were transferred to HP Enterprise after the 2015 split, and some are now handled by DXC Technology. It is the responsibility of HP Inc. to respond to public concerns and clarify the scope of its current involvement in each and every one of these. As the legal successor of Hewlett-Packard Company, HP Inc. also has an obligation to remedy harms created by its past involvement.

They say it's HP's responsibility to clarify the current scope of their work in Israel, but has the city council asked HP about this? And has the council asked representatives from Israel about this, such as the Israeli Consul General in Boston? Why are they asking the council to boycott first and ask questions later? This seems very irresponsible.

2. Israel's population registry: Transition from Digital Equipment Corporation to Compaq to HP to HPE to DXC:

> In the 1990s, the Israeli Ministry of the Interior launched the Aviv Project to modernize the computerized database that contains its population registry. The company that was contracted to design the new

> database was Digital Equipment Corporation, which was later bought by Compaq, which in 2003 merged with Hewlett-Packard Company. In 2008, Israel launched the Arbel project, to add biometric data of Israeli citizens into the population registry. The company that was contracted to implement this project was Electronic Data Systems (EDS), which in 2008 was bought by Hewlett-Packard Company. Beginning in 2013, Hewlett-Packard Company employees have been stationed at system terminals located in Israeli government buildings in order to provide technical assistance to Israeli government employees. In addition, In 2008, Hewlett-Packard Company also started producing biometric ID cards for Israeli residents, including Israeli citizens, Israeli West Bank settlers, and Palestinian residents of occupied East Jerusalem.
>
> In 2015, these contracts were transferred to HP Enterprise, and **they are now in the hands of DXC Technology**. (emphasis added)

So again, if they really want to boycott a company for this, why isn't it DXC?

3. Israel is no longer using one of the main systems that the proponents cite to argue for a boycott of HP:

> HP Inc.'s legal predecessor, Hewlett-Packard Company, held a contract with the Israeli Ministry of Defense for the maintenance of the **Basel system, a biometric access control system** that uses hand scanners and facial geometry to identify Palestinians and control their passage through Israeli military checkpoints in the occupied Palestinian territories. The Israeli system of checkpoints and discriminatory permits violates multiple international human rights and principles of international humanitarian law. The Basel System contract was handled by Hewlett-Packard Company until its 2015 split, when it was transferred to HP Enterprise. In response to a WhoProfits freedom of information inquiry, the **Israeli Ministry of Defense stated that the Basel system was scrapped at the end of 2016 and is no longer active. The Israeli military designed a different system to replace it.** (emphasis added)

So if Israel is not even using these systems anymore, why are they trying to drag Cambridge into boycotting HP?

4. A major contract in Israel that HP previously held is now held by Cisco -- (again, so why target HP??):

> In 2011, Hewlett-Packard Company won a multi-year contract worth hundreds of millions of dollars to be the exclusive provider of servers for the Israeli military and other Israeli security forces. Following the 2015 split of Hewlett-Packard Company, this contract was transferred to HP Enterprise. This contract was repeatedly extended until 2017, when **Cisco won a bid to replace it**. (emphasis added)

B. Israel and the Palestinians

The pro-boycott moral and legal case is also full of holes. For example, the AFSC document includes false charges that the Israeli blockade of Gaza is illegal, and that Israeli settlements are Jewish only (there are Israeli Muslims and other non-Jews who live in Israeli settlements).

And of course, by omitting any mention of Palestinian terrorism, the boycott proponents seem to imply that Israeli efforts to try to protect their citizens from that terrorism, including non-violent measures like putting up checkpoints is, is illegitimate. But if Israel doesn't have the right of self-defense, then it doesn't have the right to exist either.

The pro-boycott side also omits any mention of US and Israeli peace offers that would have created a Palestinian state, which the Palestinians rejected -- as I mentioned, Israel and the Saudis accepted the Clinton Parameters in 2000 at Camp David, but the Palestinian leader Yasir Arafat turned them down.

The Saudi representative, Prince Bandar, told Arafat opposing the deal would be "a crime against the Palestinian people" and promised full financial, political and religious support from Saudi Arabia.

Despite this, Arafat refused to accept the deal, went home, and started the Second Intifadah, in which thousands of Israelis were killed or wounded in suicide bombings and other brutal attacks -- on crowded buses, in shopping malls, in restaurants, outside schools among waiting parents and infants, and even in home

invasions.

Many of these attacks were far more deadly than the tragic attacks at the Marathon that we are now commemorating. You can imagine the impact this had on Israelis, politically and psychologically, especially considering Israel is such a tiny country.

Despite this, in 2008 the Israeli leader Ehud Olmert made an even more far reaching peace proposal to the Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas (Arafat had died). Abbas refused to accept and didn't even make a counter-offer. He just walked away.

Here's a link to the article I left with you on Israeli and US peace offers

The bottom line is that only by ignoring history and basic facts can one can support boycotting Israel because there is an "occupation" and no Palestinian state, or because there are checkpoints. With a peace deal the issue of settlements would be over, some near the Green Line would have been added to Israel, others would have been evacuated (just as all the Israeli settlements in Gaza were evacuated), and to make up for the land added to Israel the Palestinians would have gotten Israeli land added to their new state.

Without terrorism there wouldn't be checkpoints today, and had the Palestinians accepted President Clinton's peace plan the occupation and checkpoints would have ended 17 years ago.

As I said, only half jokingly, those who are upset that there is an occupation and checkpoints and no Palestinian state shouldn't boycott Israel, they should boycott the Palestinian Authority and Hamas.

Finally, here's a link to that article I left with you that has detailed refutations of the anti-Israel apartheid charges that are commonly repeated by those who support BDS - Deconstructing "Israeli Apartheid"

C. Further problems with the anti-HP case

According to the AFSC document another reason to boycott HP is the company's involvement in supporting the US government:

> As of 2015, Hewlett-Packard Company was ranked 41th on the list, making a $2 billion profit that year from military contracts. Most of these contracts are **now in the hands of DXC Technology**. Additionally, HP technology is used in specific weapon systems, such as the THAAD missile system.

So again DXC, not HP. And THAAD stands for Terminal High Altitude Area Defense -- it's a defensive missile system meant to shoot down incoming ballistic missiles. If, for example, North Korea fired a nuclear tipped missile at Alaska or other parts of the US, it's the THAAD that would play a major role in trying to shoot it down. And Raytheon, a MA company, is a major subcontractor.

Why would anyone want to boycott HP (or Raytheon) if they are helping with the THAAD -- are the boycott proponents in favor of the US getting hit by nuclear missiles?

One further thing, re the comparison with apartheid South Africa (and this is in that article I left with you about apartheid). Moshe Katsav was the President of Israel some years back, and when he was accused of sexually harassing some of his staff, he was indicted and brought to trial. The judge who presided over his case and who rendered a guilty verdict was an Israeli Arab. Katsav appealed to the Supreme Court, and his case was heard by a panel of three Supreme Court justices, led by an Israeli Arab Supreme Court justice. They convicted him too, and Katsav went to jail. Could you imagine in an apartheid state that apartheid's victims would twice convict the President of the state and send him to jail?

When Israelis hear their state unjustly compared to apartheid South Africa, it only makes them want to hunker down and protect themselves, not take further risks for peace. It doesn't feed their optimism, it destroys it, and without optimism there will be no peace for either side.

Thanks again and please don't hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss any of these matters further.

Alex Safian, PhD
Associate Director
CAMERA

Residence:
4 Vincent St
Cambridge MA 02140
617-721-7110 (cell)